

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, and 15-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended for clarity and to even more clearly distinguish over the applied reference (the "AAPA"), claims 3-6 and 15-18 are amended because of the amendments to claim 1, and claims 7-14 are canceled.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives at the April 10, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' record of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's agreement to accept the filing of this Supplemental Amendment.

In addition to the remarks provided with the March 6, 2006 Amendment, Applicants provide the following remarks.

With regard to section II(B) (page 7) of the March 6, 2006 Amendment, and as discussed at the interview, Applicants provide additional reasons why a person of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify the AAPA as asserted in the rejection. Specifically, the AAPA device has the piezoelectric resonator electrically connected to electrodes lying on a diagonal line of package 12, as explained in the specification at paragraph [0007] and as shown in Fig. 10C. With this arrangement, and when connected to IC 30 (as shown in Fig. 11), the AAPA device is symmetrical and can be placed in either one of two orientations; a first orientation in Fig. 10C with electrode 24a in the upper-left corner, and a second orientation with the entire device rotated 180° so that electrode 24a is in the lower-right corner. Thus, when manufactured, there is no need to identify and position a specific orientation of the AAPA device because both the first and second orientations are suitable. This symmetry would be lost if the AAPA device is modified as asserted in the rejection because the modified AAPA device would have only a single orientation, which

would require an additional manufacturing step that determines a proper orientation and that orientates the modified AAPA device accordingly.

As discussed during the interview, the claim 1 arrangement is advantageous because the pair of wiring patterns extend only along the shorter latus of the package away from the piezoelectric resonator element. Thus, parasitic capacitance that occurs in line 34 of Fig. 11 of the AAPA (which extends along the longer latus of the package) does not occur in the claim 1 arrangement. This problem in the AAPA is not recognized or addressed by the AAPA.

In view of the foregoing and in view of the remarks provided in the March 6, 2006 Amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/jam

Date: April 12, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--